

Attachment 1

Minute correction to page four, second motion to reflect motion made by Mr. Lurie. Minutes approved with correction by Planning Commission on September 7, 2006.

of parking spaces. He said the parking amendment was intended to interface with the neighborhood with landscaping and lighting compatibility. Mr. Laidlaw explained the hours of operation and various shifts affecting the neighborhood and the steps they were taking to relieve their concerns.

Discussion followed regarding:

- The future plans for redevelopment of the site to the north of the amendment site.
- The illumination and safety concerns regarding the alleyway in the back of the amendment site.
- The kind of landscaping and the exact location of the landscaping on the frontage.
- The situation on employee parking prior to the parking amendment site.
- The neighbors' concerns and the location of their property in relation to the amendment site.
- Police activity that may have occurred due to noise or traffic resulting from the business in that area.

Chair Evans opened the public hearing and asked if there were members in the audience wishing to speak on this matter.

Joanne Hershenhorn said that Michael Lineman, President of the Groves Neighborhood Association, could not attend the Planning Commission meeting and had asked Ms. Hershenhorn to announce his full support of the amendment.

MOTION by Mr. Lurie, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 9 to 0 (Mr. Benavidez, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Thomson, Mr. Wissler absent) to close the public hearing.

MOTION by Mr. ~~Williams~~ Mr. Lurie to forward this item to the Mayor and Council with a recommendation to amend the *Groves Neighborhood Plan* to allow parking on the subject property. Motion died for a lack of a second.

Discussion followed.

Ms. McBride-Olson said this amendment to allow parking on the property was not a good thing for the neighborhood. She said the entire strip was being rezoned and subject to further expansion of that parking lot and further intensity of the commercial use on the property to the north. The intensity for that property was too high for what was appropriate, next to residential. The *City of Tucson General Plan* asked for the protection of established residential neighborhoods by supporting compatible development, where the scale and intensity of use will be compatible with the adjacent uses and could be appropriately screened and buffered. Ms. McBride-Olson stated the masonry wall with barbed wire on the top with the landscape screening, did not offer buffering enhancement for that residential area.